



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,107	10/21/2004	Masayuki Suzuki	003854	6433

7590

03/23/2006

Pitney Hardin  
7 Times Square  
New York, NY 10036-7311

EXAMINER
----------

DIXON, MERRICK L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

End

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/512,107	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Merrick Dixon	1774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**MERRICK DIXON**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-27-05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1774

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the legal word, "comprising". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 7, the phrase, "the thickness" lacks proper antecedent basis. applicants are requested to provide related corrections.

3

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4

Claims 1,5,6,4 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims

1,5,6,23,24,13,14,19-22,33-36 and 38 of copending Application No. 10/339479.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the fiber sheet could be one of contamination resistance; it would

Art Unit: 1774

have been obvious to the skill artisan to coat both sheet's side with different oxide material having different valences , in the absence of unexpected results.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6

Claims 1,3,5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada et al(US 6074981).

The cited Tada et al reference teaches the claimed functional fiber sheet comprising synthetic fiber coated on both sides with metallic oxides via vapor-deposition- col 2, lines 63-67; col 3, lines 18-40; col 4, lines 41-55; col 5, lines 6-15. Concerning claim 5, the reference teaches woven material ( col 4, lines 41-45; col 7, lines 17-20) and similar fibers as required by claim 6, col 3, lines 31-34; col 4, lines 44; col 7, lines 18-23.

Concerning claims 3, the reference teaches similar thickness-col 3, lines 5-17; col 11, lines 60-64; col 12, lines 60-66; and similar percentage amounts in col 4, lines 1-12. The reference teaches various valence oxide material( see reference). it is submitted the

Art Unit: 1774

resulting sheet would have similarly claimed transparency depending on the amounts of vapor deposited layer thereon, i.e., optimum value of a result effective variable. Such optimum value coatings would have been obvious to the skilled artisan, in the absence of unexpected results – In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

7

Claims 4- is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada et al( US 6074981) alone.

The cited reference teaches the claimed invention including a process for making fiber sheet comprising vapor-depositing metal oxide on the surface of a fiber sheet- col 14, lines 47-65; col 16, lines 9-23. The reference teaches oxygen/ manipulation during the patented process- col 6, lines 35-41; col 17, lines 12-18. Such manipulation, as claimed, it is submitted, would have been also practiced in the cited reference, in the absence of unexpected results and to afford process expediency.

8

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 are have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9

Art Unit: 1774

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Applicants who wish to send a facsimile (draft copies) for the examiner's immediate review can do so by using the Examiner's personal fax number at 571-273-1520. The faxing of all papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 O.G. 30 ( November 15, 1989). **NOTE: All facsimiles sent to the examiner's personal fax number should be in draft-forms and will be treated as informal.**

**Same facsimiles will not be entered** in the related applications unless otherwise agreed and noted by the examiner.

**The fax number for all other fascimile is 571-273-8300.**

Information about **the status of an application** may be obtained from the Patent Information Retrieval system (**Private PAIR**).

Art Unit: 1774

Status inquires for **published applications** may be retrieved from either **Private PAIR** or **Public PAIR**. Questions about the PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center at **866-217-9197**.

Any questions concerning the instant communication should be directed to Examiner Dixon, at 571-272-1520, Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, between 12 noon and 8 PM, eastern time .

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Merrick Dixon', with a stylized, flowing script.

Merrick Dixon

Primary Examiner

Group 1700